

MEETING OF THE
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

May 10, 2006
2:30 PM



ROOM 324A, RUG ROOM
MARIN COUNTY CIVIC CENTER
3501 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present: Al Boro, Vice-Chair, City of San Rafael
Peter Breen, Town of San Anselmo
Alice Fredericks, Town of Tiburon
Joan Lundstrom, City of Larkspur
Steve Kinsey, Chair, Transportation Authority of Marin
Cynthia Murray, Marin County Board of Commissioners

Commissioner Members Absent: Lew Tremaine, Town of Fairfax

Staff Members Present: Dianne Steinhauser, TAM Executive Director
Craig Tackabery, Assistant Director
Kathleen Booth, Recording Secretary

Chair Steve Kinsey called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m.

1. Chair's Report

Chair Kinsey began the meeting by summarizing MTC Commission activity from that day. MTC is working through BATA on improving FasTrak. MTC staff also presented the strategic plan. There was talk of investing \$20 million in the next eleven months into FasTrak around the bay on seven state owned bridges. FasTrak locations will be standardized at each of the bridges, with the exception of the Bay Bridge. FasTrak only lanes will be added, and the lanes will be extended further back so that people can know where to get into the FasTrak lanes; signage will be created in all of the toll collection areas. There will be additional marketing to get more people to move into FasTrak.

2. Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Breen asked about the Crossing Guard Program retaining current crossing guards with contracts. The Executive Committee directed staff to bring a recap on the Crossing Guard Program with basic questions and answers to the June Exec Committee meeting.

3. Executive Director's Report

ED Steinhauser introduced Denise Merleno, the new TAM Executive Assistant/Clerk to the Board. Denise comes from the Marin Housing Authority where she was Executive Assistant to the Executive Director. She will replace Kathleen Booth.

ED Steinhauser stated she will be on vacation during the next Executive Director meeting June 14, 2006. The Executive Committee directed Craig Tackabery to fill in.

ED Steinhauser announced there will be a Funding Workshop on Monday, May 15, 2006 at 9:00am with all the Public Works Directors, Caltrans, MTC, Local Assistance folks, and TAM.

4. Approval of Minutes from April 12, 2006 Meeting

The minutes from April 12, 2006 were approved without revision.

5. Countywide Planning Adhoc Committee Report

Commissioner McGlashan began by acknowledging the efforts of Kristin Drumm, The League of Women Voters, the Sierra Club, the Marin Environmental Housing Collaborative and a number of other individuals as well as several TAM board members who worked for five months deliberating, researching history and understanding why the old County Wide Planning Agency (CWPA) became moribund and how it might or might not be resurrected.

The subcommittee studied history, particularly the agency back in the 70s/80s. The original organization was called the City County Planning Committee, CCPC, and then the CWPA. It had a joint powers of authority from 1992. The Special Committee went over the history of those activities. They also spent two meetings speaking with guest speakers, including Mark Riesenfeld, who talked about the old agencies and the other JPAs that exist already in the county so they would not duplicate work done by the City Managers Assn. or the Planners' Assn. etc. In the end, there was a strong consensus of the people present at the various meetings that a group like the CWPA could add value to the county in two principal ways: 1) as opportunities arise, it could consolidate work efforts and save staff's time, citing the Housing Workbook as an example; 2) it would add value in unifying our voice in analyzing our housing needs and articulating those and the right strategies to get it with ABAG. The subcommittee reached the following conclusions:

- 1) On the issue of housing, it could be an area of focus where the committee could add value to the county if the electeds of the cities and the county are talking with one another and focusing on identifying good locations for affordable and other types of housing. That would be a value-add for the community even if nothing formal was done about it. The second and more compelling reason why the committee recommends this be focused on the electeds is to create a venue for electeds to assemble and discuss the cumulative impacts that we're doing to ourselves as individual planning jurisdictions.
- 2) They recommended that they stay a committee of TAM, which is still subject to some discussion. They want to ask the TAM board members to participate but even better, ask the TAM board members to appoint an alternate who's fired up about the planning discussions. The TAM board member would be the formal member of the agency but the committee could be populated by any member of a council that wants to talk about cumulative impacts, land use, housing, etc.

Commissioner McGlashan reiterated the committee's promise that these meetings are not about creating mandates or passing judgment on county plans. He stressed that the subcommittee is not asking anyone for money and that Alex Hinds and Kristin Drumm have offered to staff the meetings and compile the reports. He concluded by saying that a discussion on land use quickly brings in the topic of traffic, which is why the subcommittee would like to remain with TAM. However, if something more formal is ever required, it would be taken to the CWPA as TAM. Commissioner McGlashan offered to work with staff over the summer to rewrite the JPA and get it approved at the September 2006 meeting.

Commissioner Kinsey asked for clarification as to why the group saw the JPA structure as being necessary if this is a committee meeting three times a year. Commissioner McGlashan replied that he is not sure it is necessary but added that one advantage is that if the JPA documents are rewritten, then it is a formal structure, and the committee would discuss the issues and bring recommendations up to the board as needed.

Commissioner Kinsey recognized Alex Hinds who commented that other alternatives have been raised that including keeping the subcommittee informal with no need for a JPA. He believes that this subcommittee creates an opportunity to have some collaboration but mentioned that some of the city managers feel that the group really needs to be a bit more specific about what is meant by cumulative impact analysis. Alex believes that the kind of cumulative analysis done in the past through the CWPA was found to be helpful. Further, he thinks that a new type of analysis using benchmarks and indicators could be helpful. He acknowledged that a clear statement needs to be presented that it isn't about one group pointing a finger at another group and saying, "You're doing something wrong." It's more about where we're heading and are we heading in the direction that we want to go.

Chair Kinsey opened the issue for discussion.

Commissioner Fredericks commented that she believes that this subcommittee would be useful for a broader perspective, however, she is concerned about the time/cost factor.

Commissioner Breen expressed concern about a perceived shadow government.

Commissioner Lundstrom said that TAM is extremely busy with its current workload and feels that this forum should not take place through TAM.

Commissioner Boro commented that some of the topics covered by this subcommittee could be best addressed by the city planners at their monthly meeting. Further, he said that he believes each community needs to take care of their own housing needs. However, he did acknowledge that TAM would provide a good forum since electeds from all the political jurisdictions would be represented.

In response to a question from Commissioner McGlashan on how to reconcile the business of TAM in this forum, Commissioner Boro responded that TAM's director would not play a role in the meeting. Rather, the countywide Planning Director and possibly the cities' Planning Directors would be invited to participate. He summarized by saying that a special meeting would be called for TAM but the agenda that night would be regarding countywide planning issues of common significance for the sake of discussion.

Commissioner Murray stated her concern that, oftentimes, things that look good on paper turn out to have unintended consequences. However, she is totally committed to the need for more policy discussion. She said that the trend is towards integration and cited her involvement with ABAG's Regional Planning committee which "doesn't have any teeth" but does give presentations to different entities on different issues of the day. She also expressed concern that the times when these countywide planning issues come to the forefront is around plan update times and it is perhaps at those times where an intense discussion on policies take place prior to being adopted.

Commissioner Lundstrom commented that her city staff has its own plan and regards the countywide plan as informational. Additionally, she said that the money normally used for updating her city's general plan has been reallocated to repair potholes and storm drains.

Commissioner Breen recommended removing it from the aegis of TAM's board until such time as there is clarity of purpose for the group.

Commissioner Murray envisioned three scenarios: 1) the subcommittee could be made up of the members of TAM but not function as TAM, and do either a pre-meeting of TAM or a special meeting to host, but it won't be TAM itself hosting, just the same people wearing a different hat.; 2) it could be a different group completely called The Regional Planning Committee from Marin County with different people signing up to be on it. The meetings could be held on a different night and the members drive the agenda topics; or 3) adopt the model that as presented by the committee and allow TAM members to look at it and make some recommendations. The subcommittee then functions in an advisory capacity to TAM to give them recommendations.

Alex Hinds suggested that he and ED Steinhauser meet and discuss if putting this subcommittee under the TAM umbrella would be helpful to TAM. ED Steinhauser agreed.

Chair Kinsey requested that ED Steinhauser and Mr. Hinds work together to prepare a report that would come to TAM based on this conversation of the Executive Committee and the different concerns, considerations, and alternative structures and be prepared to make that report. Ms. Steinhauser agreed to present this report at the May 2006 board meeting.

6. Update on Future Fund Sources

This item was tabled until the May 2006 meeting.

7. FY2006 Budget Adjustment

ED Steinhauser stated that a mid-year budget adjustment is scheduled to go to the board and had been brought to this committee, previously, in March 2006. A supplemental packet was distributed to the group since revisions had been made after the original packet was mailed.

Additional RM2 funds will be added to the budget based on increased line activity that is consistent with the initial project report that this committee considered at previous meetings for design activity in the Greenbrae corridor. Staff will not be taking out bond proceeds as had been considered earlier in the year for the Gap Closure project since there are enough funds already available to begin work. There will not be, more than likely, any need to do any debt financing until FY 07/08 or FY 08/09, if at all. Staff will not be spending any of the FHWA earmark for the Marin/Sonoma Narrows as previously thought. It will be dedicated, solely, to support activities in the next fiscal year.

Regarding expenditures, some of the smaller changes include: funds to purchase furniture and equipment will be utilized in the next fiscal year, as opposed to the current one, due to pending ADA issues at the new office location. She hopes to bring a lease on this space in June 2006. She reported further that she is working on changing the structure of the contract with LGS to provide a clearer reporting of salaries and benefits vs. fees. There will be a small amount of money available for TAM's information technology consultant. An RFP for a state-level legislative consultant was sent out with a deadline date of July 2006, this position will not be filled until September/October 2006. Major changes include approximately \$100,000 of additional program management support costs from Nolte due to the delay in bringing staff onboard until later than anticipated. As well, there is a minor adjustment to the design contract for the Gap Closure path and soundwall work. A budget of \$1,462,000 was adopted in

January 2006 for the Gap Closure project design. However, additional support activity in the amount of approximately \$100,000 is required.

In summary, overall, we're trending under what was forecasted in the budget for FY 05/06. TAM is trending even on the revenue side and low on the expenditure side. The recommendation will be for the Board to adopt the new projected amount for FY05/06. In response to a question from Chair Kinsey as to whether the only way to hold reserves is as a carryover, ED Steinhauser stated that the agency's carryover consists of unused Measure A funds from FY04/05 and FY05/06. Further, she confirmed that a contingency reserve exists in the amount of 5%. Chair Kinsey requested notation be added to the budget worksheet to indicate unused fund balances in various accounts. Nancy Whelan, TAM's financial consultant, said that she will make the requested changes.

The committee authorized the item to be brought to the full TAM Board for approval.

8. Draft FY 2006/07 Work Plan

ED Steinhauser commented that this item was reviewed by the Board previously in March. At the March 2006 board meeting, a request was made to add TAM interactions with the City/County of San Francisco regarding the Doyle Drive project. This was added as a work-item element under Planning. ED Steinhauser commented that the workplan was somewhat optimistic, especially since the Board has authorized six employees rather than the staff of ten currently carrying the workload. Additional support will continue to be provided by consultants. As the quarterly reporting period nears, prioritization may be required and the committee will be asked to provide input on it.

Commissioner Murray commented that Marin County could experience the "perfect storm" of traffic congestion given the number of projects underway throughout the area. ED Steinhauser replied that CalTrans, MTC, and the CHP have the ability to traffic manage multiple projects and that it might be a good idea to have a representative from that team attend a future meeting and speak to the group about the functions of the Traffic Management Center, or TMC, in Oakland.

In response to a question from Chair Kinsey about the website being listed in Programming and Planning and whether this item needed to be added in the Program Delivery side to balance the equation, staff agreed to add this. He also suggested in the future, that administrative functions, such as lease negotiation, be listed as a separate category. He noted that the board workshop he requested be scheduled for some point this year was absent from this plan. Further, he asked about the east/west congestion issue he had raised previously and whether a study could be included in the item titled "Congestion Management Plan develop CMP scope..." ED Steinhauser replied affirmatively and agreed to incorporate his changes.

The committee approved the item to be brought to the full TAM Board for approval.

9. Draft FY 2006/07 Budget

ED Steinhauser asked the committee to direct staff to schedule a public hearing after a 30-day comment period at the regularly scheduled board meeting in June 2006. She reviewed changes and summarized upcoming activity, such as continuing the transition to setting up the office, hiring staff and the use of professional services in the upcoming year. There is potential for some new revenues with Assembly Bill 2538 which is an increase in the planning, programming and monitoring funds that we receive. Currently, we receive approximately \$24,000/year; that figure could increase to approximately \$100,000/year. This increase is necessary given high activity at the state level regarding funding. She

added that, later in this meeting, she will ask the committee to support this bill. She went to discuss the set-aside of a 5% reserve, versus the previous 10%. The budget lists planned expenditures per the strategic plan for the strategies coming up next year. Note there is also a carryover balance of \$6,645,000 projected for the end of June 2006, but that these funds are restricted. TAM spent less than anticipated on Highway 101 construction costs. TAM is spending exactly what it allocated to the Marin County Transit District. There will remain a small amount of funds in the Safe Routes program and Safe Pathways. ED Steinhauser pointed out new line items in the Preliminary Proposed Budget attachment. Nancy Whelan, TAM's financial consultant, reported that TAM will not take advantage of its line of credit due to the accumulated balance.

The committee authorized the Executive Director to schedule a public hearing after a 30-day comment period.

10. State Legislation Overview

ED Steinhauser introduced this item as general concepts based on legislation that support funding through the federal and state appropriations. She also stated that there are two bills that address vehicle registration fees and she requested the committee's approval to support those bills. In response to a question from Commissioner Murray about who is planning to connect SMART, Golden Gate, and MTC together so that there is connectivity, ED Steinhauser responded: TAM is involved in the regional transportation planning process at MTC, which is the primary mechanism for integration within the region. As well, TAM monitors MTC in their transit expansion program. Chair Kinsey added that under the RM2 measure, MTC was required to do a connectivity study. Commissioner Murray asked if this committee should look at Joe Nation's gas tax increase for a position. ED Steinhauser noted that the recent GO Bond bill has set aside Nation's proposal for now.

The committee agreed to recommend the legislative program.

11. Bike/Pedestrian Path Maintenance

ED Steinhauser introduced this item and cited the Lincoln Hill/Puerto Suello bike/ped path that TAM is building as part of the Gap Closure project. This project will be incorporated into the CalTrans highway project, and a co-op agreement needs to be signed with CalTrans that incorporates those features into the project and funds them through the fund sources discussed in the past for Highway 101. This agreement would be brought to the committee, ideally, in June 2006. One of the features in the agreement is who will maintain the path and sound wall. Discussion has been ongoing for several months. Ideally, the agreement needs to be signed by the City of San Rafael as the party responsible for the maintenance and by TAM as the funding party. This is one of the drivers for the discussion.

There are three issues related to these paths: 1) aspects of policing and security of the paths; 2) major maintenance; and 3) routine maintenance. Typically the paths are policed by the local jurisdictions in which they lie. Major maintenance is a concern but, due to the lack of inventory, it is unclear how significant this issue is. ED Steinhauser suggested that an investigation of existing pathways could be conducted to see if there is a major maintenance shortfall. Routine maintenance includes tasks like sweeping paths, graffiti removal and sign replacement. For existing path segments, there is an entity responsible for this maintenance. However, not much money is being spent by the responsible entity on these items. Regarding path segments that are currently under construction, there is concern about the lack of available funds to maintain these new segments and whether that may keep the project from moving forward. Issues remain as to the need and what priority maintenance should be.

The only funding TAM has that could be decided on by Board policy is the interest it earns from cash balances. ED Steinhauser recommended one policy option: that cities/towns could access these funds for maintenance activities if they matched them \$1 for \$1. The only other possible source of funding would be "off the top" funding from the local infrastructure category. However, this money is clearly allocated to other expense line items, and she recommended that this route not be taken.

Chair Kinsey opened this item for discussion. He asked who is responsible for tracking the status of routine maintenance by jurisdictions and where the routine maintenance challenges lie. It was noted that for County facilities, Parks and Open Space tracks it. Commissioner Murray suggested that staff investigate the condition of the paved pathways. Ms. Steinhauser suggested that, for new projects, an agreement be set up with the city where the path exists to co-fund ongoing maintenance of the facility that was funded out of Measure A. Alice Frederick suggested that all communities be taken into account if a policy is made. Commissioner Murray would like the maintenance responsibility to stay with the entities and TAM would be responsible for any additional paths. A member of the Bicycle Coalition thanked select members of this group for the time they have invested in this item.

Chair Kinsey summarized that this issue needs to be examined further. He requested that additional thoughts be compiled and a recommendation made to the committee at the next meeting which can be further recommended to the full TAM board as necessary. Commissioner Murray would like to see a cap be placed on how much money is spent on maintenance so that the majority of funds aren't used in this specific area. ED Steinhauser said that she would draft a policy statement and action item list as to what she believes the committee would find as acceptable language and goals for inventory and fund sources.

12. U.S. 101 Corridor Projects Update

This item was tabled until the May 2006 meeting.

13. Open Time for Public Expression

There was no further public comment.

Chair Kinsey adjourned the Executive TAM meeting at 4:50 p.m.